DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 319 CE 025 611

TITLE	Shortchanged and Slighted: An Assessment of the Department of Labor's National Response to Women's Employment and Training Needs.
INSTITUTION	Wider Opportunities for Women, Inc., Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jan 79
NOTE	27p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Wider Opportunities for Women, 1511 K St., N.W., Suite 345, Washington, DC 20005 (Single copies free).
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Employed Women; Employment Level; Employment Problems; *Employment Programs; Employment Statistics; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Federal Programs; *Females; National Programs; Program Administration; *Program Effectiveness; Underemployment
IDENTIFIERS	*Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; *Department of Labor

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the administration of funds under Title III of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act by the Department of Labor (DOL) with respect to women workers. (Title III funds are discretionary funds administered by DOL's Employment and Training Administration, Division of National Programs (DNP), to provide additional services to special segments of the population, in this case, women.) Six specific DNP-administered programs are examined: Apprenticeship Outreach, Journeyman Outreach Training, National On-the-Job Training, Promotion and Development, Operational Support to Community-Based Organizations, and Program for Selected Population Segments. The analysis indicates "a serious lack of commitment to the employment needs of women at a national level." Major conclusions of the report are that DNP (1) appears to have no formal, comprehensive affirmative action policy regarding women for existing contracts; (2) has funded only a few employment programs designated specifically for women; (3) has not significantly reduced the barriers restricting women's access to well paid skilled jobs, and (4) has best served women by the successful placement of women in skilled jobs and apprenticeships with high earning potential. The DOL is urged to bring its policies and practices into conformity with the reality that women now make up a very large portion of its constituency. (MEK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED1893319

WOMEN'S WORK FORCE

A NATIONAL RESOURCE AND ADVOCACY NETWORK FOR WOMEN'S EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS
1649 K Street N.W. 4th Fl. Washington D.C. 20006 202 638-4900

A PROJECT OF WIDER OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN, INC.

SHORTCHANGED AND SLIGHTED:

An Assessment of the Department of Labor's National Response to Women's Employment and Training Needs

January 1979

OUTLINE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	
WOW's Advocacy Activities	Page 1
Monitoring DNP Programs	Page 1
CETA and Title III	Page 2
Employment Status and Needs of Women	Page 3
Division of National Programs: A Close Look	Page 6
Conclusions	Page 14
Recommendations	Page 15
Attachments	Page 17

CE 025 611

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Kerr

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

INTRODUCTION

WOW and the Women's Work Force Network and Advocacy Project

In 1977, Wider Opportunities for Women, Inc. (WOW) established a Washington resource and advocacy program for the over 100 women's job action and advocacy groups throughout the country. WOW formed the Women's Work Force (WWF) network to provide information exchange, monitoring, and advocacy activities designed to influence national women's employment issues. WWF alerts network groups to public policy developments, collects information from local groups, suggests needed action, promotes women's employment interests in Congress and in federal agencies, develops and distributes information and technical assistance materials among network groups, and facilitates collective strategizing and pressure activities.

During the past year WOW's advocacy program has been instrumental in four key areas: (1) pressuring the Department of Labor to issue federal regulations requiring affirmative action for women in construction and apprenticeships; (2) working to obtain stronger language in the CETA reauthorization bill regarding the training/employment needs of women workers; (3) preparing the first National Directory of Women's Employment Programs: Who They Are; What They Do; and (4) monitoring the Department of Labor's response to women's employment needs and programs, specifically within the Employment and Training Administration's Division of National Programs. The following report explains this fourth activity in detail.

Monitoring the Department of Labor: The Employment and Training Administration's Division of National Programs

For the past six months, WWF has examined the Employment and Training Administration's Division of National Programs to ascertain the Department of Labor's (DOL) response to women's employment needs. The Division of National Programs (DNP) administers five programs funded by

Title III of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA). Title III of CETA contains the Secretary of Labor's discretionary fund designated to give additional employment and training services to special segments of the population suffering particular disadvantages in the labor market. Although all other CETA funds are disseminated through 450 Prime Sponsors throughout the country, Title III funds are dispensed directly from the Department of Labor at the national level. Since women as a group face major disadvantages in the labor market, they clearly should be served by DNP programs. This examination of how the Division of National Programs serves--or rather does not serve--women workers indicates a serious lack of commitment by DOL to women's employment needs at the national level.

CETA AND TITLE III

The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) was enacted initially in 1973 to decentralize the design and delivery of employment and training programs to the state and local government levels.[1] The purpose of CETA is to provide job training and employment opportunities for economically disadvantaged, unemployed, and underemployed persons, and to assure that training and other services lead to maximum employment opportunity and improved employability by establishing a flexible and decentralized system for federal, state and local programs.[2] The CETA legislation allows decisions about the kinds of employment and training programs, allocation of money, populations served, kinds of delivery systems, and related matters to be made at the state and local levels by CETA program operators, known as Prime Sponsors (currently 450).

Incorporated in the Act, however, is a provision for continuing categorical funding to programs for special target groups. This provision in Title III authorizes the Secretary of Labor to provide

---

1. CETA was recently reauthorized, in a revised format, by the 95th Congress, for four more years.

2. Statement of Purpose. Public Law 93-203, Dec. 28, 1973.

additional employment and training programs to segments of the population that are in particular need of such services, including youth, offenders, persons of limited English-speaking ability, older workers, and other persons whom the Secretary determines to have particular disadvantages in the labor market.[1]

Administrative responsibility for Title III of CETA lies for the most part within two offices of the Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration: the Office of Youth, and the Office of National Programs. Youth programs receive almost 80% of Title III money; migrants and farmworkers receive about 5%; Indian and Native Americans receive approximately 4%; veterans receive about 1%, and National Programs receive about 5.6%. (See Attachment #1 for Preliminary FY 78 Budget Outlays for Title III.)

The focus of this report is on the Division of National Programs, which in 1978 distributed approximately $82,000,000 of Title III money designed to provide additional employment and training services to those segments of the population suffering particularly severe disadvantages in the labor market--the unemployed, underemployed and disadvantaged. A disproportionately large percentage of this target population is female.

EMPLOYMENT STATUS AND NEEDS OF WOMEN

The number of women in the labor force has more than doubled since 1950. National legislation mandating the elimination of sex discrimination in employment has been on the books for over 10 years. Despite these historic developments, women's employment status has shown little improvement--in fact, has actually deteriorated. As of this year (1978), half of all women over 16 (41 million) are in the work force. Women comprise 42% of the total national work force, yet employment disparities between the sexes have never been more pronounced.

---

1. Public Law 93-203, Sec. 301(a), Dec. 28, 1973.

Wage Differential

The wage differential has actually increased in the last 20 years. According to 1977 figures, women working full-time, year-round, had a median income of $8,814--only 59% of men's median income of $15,070.[1] Fifty-five percent (55%) of all women workers over age 14 have incomes of less than $5,000 per year, whereas only 27% of comparable men have incomes under $5,000 per year. At the other end of the pay scale, only 8% of the women, as opposed to 42% of the men, have incomes over $12,000.[2] Data collected in 1976 on income level by sex and age demonstrate that a woman's income level peaks at age 34 at $5,372, whereas a man's income level peaks at age 44 at $14,326.[3]

Occupational Segregation

Approximately 80% of the female work force is concentrated in low-skilled, low-paying jobs: 34% in clerical positions, 21% in service positions, 16% in professional and technical positions (mostly school teachers and nurses), and 11% in operative positions.[4] Women comprise 98% of all secretaries, 94% of all typists, 78% of all clerical workers, 95% of all private household workers, 64% of all service workers, but less than 10% of all skilled workers, and less than 5% of top managers.[5] Women seek or are tracked into "traditional" female jobs. Few make it into the world of "traditional" male work, with its higher pay and greater upward mobility.

---

1. "An Overview of Women in the Workforce", Center for Women and Work Statistics from U.S. DOL, B.L.S., and the Women's Bureau, 1978.
2. "Money, Income and Poverty Status of Families and Persons in the U.S.: 1976. U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Series P-60, No. 107. As appearing in "Women, Work and Wages", a Report of the National Council on Women, Work and Welfare, Oct. 1978.
3. "Women, The Poorer Sex", a report of the National Council on Women, Work and Welfare, May 1978.
4. "Women in the Labor Force", distributed by the Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor, June, 1978.
5. "A Few Facts About Working Women", distributed by the National Commission on Working Women, 1978.

Women Excluded from the Skilled Trades

In 1977, of the 12 million skilled blue-collar workers, only slightly over half a million (594,000, or about 5%) were women. Nearly one-third of these few women worked in lower-paying skilled jobs that are closely related to homemaking skills (e.g., upholsterers, bakers, tailors, decorators, window dressers). Among the many well-paid skilled workers, such as carpenters, plumbers, electricians, and painters, the proportion of women ranged from less than 1% to about 3%.[1]

Even fewer women are employed in the 450 apprenticeable trades which offer excellent training opportunities and good pay. As of the end of 1977, women were only 2.2% of all apprentices in this country (5,780 out of a total of 262,586). Most women in apprentice programs were, again, in the lower-paying, traditionally female apprenticeships. Of all the apprenticeable trades, only the barber/beautician trade had more women than men (58.5%). Women were respectively 15.4% of bookbinders, 13% of optical workers, 12.9% of cooks and bakers, 12.6% of compositors, 12.1% of medical and dental technicians, and 10.9% of industrial technicians. The enrollment of women in all other trades was less than 10%--in most cases, less than 1%. Although close to 60% of the apprenticeable trades are in the construction field, only 1.06% of these apprentices were women (1,665 out of 157,306).[2]

Women in Poverty

Clearly, women must have access to these and other nontraditional job options. The need for women to achieve equity in the work force is greater now than ever before. In increasing numbers, women are heads of household, economically responsible for the support of themselves and their dependents. Since 1970, the number of female family heads has risen

---

1. "A Woman's Guide to Apprenticeship", U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, 1978, p. 1.

2. State and National Apprenticeship Systems Report (SNAPS) for January 1, 1977-December 31, 1977.

almost 50%, from 2.9 to 4.3 million. Nearly 60% were under age 35.[1] As of March, 1978, 14% (about one in every seven) of all American families were headed by women.

- These families live on less than one-half the family income of husband-wife families.[2]
- Forty-five percent of all families living below the Federal poverty line are headed by women.
- Almost one-third of all female-headed families in the country live in poverty.
- Race doubles women's economic vulnerability--50.1% of all black families headed by women live below the poverty level, as opposed to 25.9% of all white female-headed families.[3]

Need for Leadership and Commitment

This is a bleak picture. Equity and economic survival demand that the CETA system, in all its components, provide adequate job training and placement opportunities for women as an especially disadvantaged segment of the population. Without strong commitment and leadership at the national level, however, the CETA system cannot begin to serve equitably the economic needs of women workers. The following detailed look at the way the Division of National Programs administers Title III money for special segments of the population clearly documents the need for such leadership and commitment at the highest levels of the Department of Labor.

THE DIVISION OF NATIONAL PROGRAMS

As mandated by the Department's Employment and Training Administration (ETA), the Division of National Programs (DNP) serves specific target groups--youth, older workers, the handicapped, women, minorities, and

---

1. "Women Who Head Families", 1970-1977, Monthly Labor Review, February, 1978, p. 34, as cited in New Approaches to CETA Training: An Overview of Title III National Programs for Selected Population Segments. U.S. Department of Labor, June, 1978.
2. "An Overview of Women in the Workforce", Center for Women and Work. Statistics from U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Women's Bureau.
3. "Women, The Poorer Sex", a Report of the National Council on Women, Work and Welfare. May, 1978.

others having a particular disadvantage in the labor market. It contracts for training programs and related services with labor unions, business associations, industrial corporations, national employment and training agencies, and community-based organizations.[1]

In FY 1978, the DNP had five major programs which let contracts totaling $82,547,000. These programs and their individual obligations were as follows:

Apprenticeship Outreach Program (AOP)	$19.8 million
Journeyman Outreach & Training Program (JOTP)	$ 2.3 million
National On-the-Job Training (NAT-OJT)	$23.1 million
Promotion and Development (P&D)	$26.7 million
Program for Operational Support to Community-based Organizations (CBO)	$10.6 million[2]

The first three, AOP, JOTP, and NAT-OJT, were designed specifically to increase opportunities for the unemployed, underemployed, and economically disadvantaged (primarily minorities) to enter skilled occupations with a heavy emphasis on the construction trades.[3] WOW has looked at the five major components of DNP to determine: (1) how many women's programs were funded; (2) how many women were served by all contractors; and (3) the level of training and the quality of placement provided for the women in all programs.

Apprenticeship Outreach Program

The Apprenticeship Outreach Program (AOP) is an affirmative action program[4] that recruits, refers and places primarily minority persons who wish to enter the building and construction trades or other skilled

---

1. "ETA Interchange", U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, January, 1978, Vol. IV, No. 1, p. 4.

2. From the Office of Administration of the Division of National Programs, October 1, 1978.

3. In FY 79 these three programs will be combined and referred to as Training Outreach Programs, or TOP.

4. "Affirmative action effort shall mean a program effort intended to provide or foster new employment opportunities for members of groups which have, for reasons of past custom, historical practice or otherwise, been discouraged from entering certain occupational fields." From "Regulations for Title III", Section 97.307, Federal Register, Vol. 41, No. 50, Friday, March 12, 1976, p. 10776.

occupations as indentured apprentices. AOP programs operate in about 100 cities and in 1978 had a budget of $19,824,000 for 23 contracts--6 of which were national in scope, the rest local programs. (See Attachment #2 for complete list of AOP 1978 contracts, the total number of persons placed under each contract, the number of women placed under each contract, and the percent of women placed under each contract.

There were only 4 programs for women out of the 23 funded in 1978. These were:

Minority Women's Employment Program (MWEP), 8 cities[1]	$648,000
Better Jobs for Women (BJW), Denver	128,000
Women in Apprenticeship (WIA), San Francisco	108,000
Wisconsin Division of Apprenticeship & Training, Madison	31,000
TOTAL	$915,000

These programs represent a total outlay for women's programs of $915,000--4.6% of the AOP funds for FY 78. (The MWEP Program just this year has been transferred to AOP from the Office of Research and Development. If its budget outlay is therefore discounted here, the commitment to women's programs drops to .8%.)

The Minority Women's Employment Program (MWEP), the only national women's program funded, is part of the Recruitment and Training Program (RTP) and operates currently in 8 cities. Begun in 1972, MWEP was the first effort to extend the techniques of apprenticeship outreach beyond the construction labor market to serve minority women seeking managerial, technical, and professional jobs. In 1978, this program placed 381 women, 95% of whom had sizeable increases in salary.

Better Jobs for Women (BJW) in Denver was the first pilot apprenticeship program for women funded by ETA, beginning in 1971. It has been successful in breaking down barriers that have historically excluded women from the skilled trades. In 1977, they placed 100 women at a total cost of $107,000. The average starting salary for enrollees was $4.48 per hour and all placements were in positions with potential earnings of from $6.00 to $10.00 per hour.[2]

---

1. Atlanta, Boston, Cincinnati, Dallas, Houston, Los Angeles, New Orleans, and Tulsa.
2. Women in Nontraditional Jobs: A Program Model, Denver: Better Jobs for Women. U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, 1978, p. 1.

The Women In Apprenticeship Program (WIA) in San Francisco has served 5 Bay area counties since 1974. WIA placed 110 women in 1977 at a cost of $79,522. This was 40 more than their stated goal. These women earned from $3.00 to $5.00 per hour while being trained and averaged wages of $7.00+ per hour upon placement. This program has consistently exceeded its numerical placement goals.

The Wisconsin Women in Apprenticeship Project does not place women, but is a research and demonstration project which works to isolate, analyze and minimize the barriers to women's entry into the skilled trades via apprenticeship. Because of the project, the Dictionary of Occupational Titles was subjected to a major revision eliminating sexist titles and low ratings for skilled "female" occupations.

The placement of women in all AOP programs for FY 77 was reported by DNP to be 19%.[1] However, a closer look at the data reveals that women were either not represented or grossly underrepresented in all the skilled trades. It is not possible to determine exactly how many women were actually placed in apprenticeships, but in the period from July 1, 1976, to June 30, 1977, only 11% of all women placed by AOP contractors were in the skilled trades--the other 89% of the women were placed in lower-paying jobs which by definition paid less than $4.00 per hour.[2] All skilled trades except painter and tile setter had fewer than 5% women. (See Attachment #3.)

Of the 22 AOP contracts in FY 77 (MWEP is new this year), 12 served fewer than 10% women, 4 served fewer than 5% women, and 2 served no women. (See Attachment #2.) The National Urban League served the highest percentage of women (outside of the women's programs): 27.6%. Their Labor Education Advancement Programs (LEAP) have special staffs to recruit women for nontraditional work. The AFL-CIO Human Resources Development Institute (HRDI) in FY 77 had a 10% placement rate for women; however, only 3% were placed in apprenticeships.[3]

---

1. "AOP Progress Report for FY 77", ONP-ETA-DOL, July, 1978, developed from reports submitted by project sponsors during FY 77.
2. AOP Women Placements by Trades, July 1, 1976-June 30, 1977, ONI-ETA-DOL.
3. Final Reports from HRDI, for FY 77.

Journeyman Outreach Training Program (JOTP)

The Journeyman Outreach Training Program is an affirmative action program engaged in outreach recruitment, training and placement services for people who usually have age as an obstacle to entering regular apprenticeship programs. This program leads to journeyman status and full union membership. The only sponsor under this program is the National Ironworkers and Employers Training Program (NIETP), which has a grant for $2,326,000 in FY 78 to train 750 disadvantaged men and women in 50 cities. In FY 77 they had 471 placements; none were women.

National On-The-Job Training (NAT-OJT)

The National On-the-Job Training Program provides on-the-job training, sometimes in conjunction with classroom instruction, for unemployed and underemployed persons. Opportunities for minorities, disadvantaged persons, women, and Vietnam-era veterans are sought in skilled and semi-skilled occupations. NAT-OJT programs are operated throughout the country by labor unions, trade association employers (e.g., Southern Railway System), and special interest organizations (e.g., the National Epilepsy Foundation, Association of Retarded Citizens, etc.).

In FY 78, NAT-OJT awarded 27 contracts amounting to $23,069,000. One is specifically for women--to the Graphic Arts International Union for $250,650. This program, operates in 23 cities, trains and upgrades 100 women in nontraditional jobs in the printing industry. The contract budget of $250,650 is approximately 1% of the total NAT-OJT budget for 1978.

The placement rate for women in all NAT-OJT programs in FY 77 was about 18%.[1] However, women placed in the construction trades were only 2.7% of those total placements. (See Attachment #3.) Of the 21

1. NAT-OJT Progress Report for FY 77, Office of National Programs, Employment Training Administration, Department of Labor, July, 1978, developed from final reports submitted by project sponsors during FY 77.

contracts awarded in FY 77, 10 served fewer than 10% women, 7 served fewer than 5%. (See Attachment #4 for complete list of FY 1978 NAT-OJT contracts, the total number of persons placed under each contract, the number of women placed under each contract, and the percent of women placed under each contract.)

Thus, although DNP reports that 18% of these placements were women, a closer look indicates that women were not being placed in the skilled jobs which provide better pay and upward mobility. For the most part, women were placed in traditional "female" occupations, thus perpetuating their generally low status in the labor market.

Promotion and Development Program (P & D)

The Promotion and Development Program is composed of a group of projects under which "an appropriate business, labor, community or social organization undertakes to promote specific activities to advance understanding and acceptance of national employment and training priorities and policies." In each instance, the contractor undertakes to provide information and assistance in the form of conferences, speeches, meetings, publicity, participation in planning councils, and other communication efforts. The purpose of the program is "to foster the active involvement of a given segment of the community in the Federal employment and training effort."[1]

Funding for all P & D programs was $26,714,000 for FY 78. (See Attachment #5 for all contracts funded in FY 78.) The two largest programs currently in operation are conducted by the National Alliance of Business (NAB) whose FY 78 funding was $13,493,000, and the Human Resources Development Institute (HRDI) of the AFL-CIO, whose funding in FY 78 was $5,351,000. Conversations with representatives of NAB have made it clear to us that serving women's employment needs is not an official priority. On the other hand, HRDI states that women are considered part

1. "National Employment and Training Programs", U.S. Department of Labor, Employment Training Administration, 1977, pp. 9 and 10.

of their constituency. However, no special funding has been allocated to implement women's programs. (See Attachment #5 for all contracts and their funding levels.)

We have been unable to determine from available ETA information how women's employment needs are addressed under these programs, or, in fact, what the general funding guidelines are for P & D programs.

Program for Operational Support to Community-Based Organizations (CBO's)[1]

The Department of Labor provides operational support to the national offices of community-based organizations to provide programmatic assistance to its CETA-funded affiliates and to promote additional work force funding from among state and local Prime Sponsors. The affiliates form a major block of service deliverers operating under CETA Prime Sponsors.[2]

Funding for CBO support was $10,615,000 in FY 78. (See Attachment #5 for all contracts funded in FY 78.) Major sponsors and their funding levels were: the Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America (OIC), $4,046,000, Jobs for Progress, Inc./Service Employment and Redevelopment (SER), $2,694,000; the Puerto Rican Forum, $1,639,000; and the National Urban League, $1,599,000.

The National Program for Selected Population Segments (NPSPS)

In addition to the five major components of DNP described above, special mention should be made of a unique program which was funded in 1977 under Title III for one year only: the National Program for Selected Population Segments (NPSPS).

---

1. Community-based organizations are defined as organizations which are representative of communities or significant segments of communities and which provide manpower services (for example, Opportunities Industrialization Center (OIC), Urban League (NUL), Jobs for Progress, Mainstream, Community Action Agencies, and other community organizations). Compilation of Current Regulations for Titles I, II and VI of CETA, Federal Register, Tuesday, October 18, 1977, Part II, Sec. 94.4(k), p. 55730.

2. "National Employment and Training Programs", U.S. DOL, ETA, 1977, p. 14.

NPSPS was a $20,000,000 program funded under CETA Title III during FY 77 to provide employment and training services to members of a number of special population segments--women, rural workers, youth, ex-offenders, older workers and handicapped clients. The $20,000,000 was divided among the ten ETA regions in proportion to the size of their Title I funding and was disseminated via Prime Sponsors. NPSPS was funded for one year only; after the first year, successful NPSPS projects had to try to be picked up as part of a Prime Sponsor's regular operations. The budget for NPSPS, FY 77, and the number of programs were as follows:

	Budget	# Programs	# Refunded	% Refunded
Handicapped	$6,313,188	21	11	52
Women	5,475,289	26	8	31
Youth	4,201,764	16	7	44
Ex-Offenders	1,167,134	7	1	14
Older Workers	905,175	5	2	40
Rural Labor Force	825,781	4	4	100
Other	441,166	3	0	0

The women's programs, for the most part, emphasized training in nontraditional fields--e.g., construction trades, building maintenance, automobile sales, insurance sales, air conditioning repair and maintenance, and wastewater treatment plant operation. The women's programs served 3,760 women that year.

Of the 26 women's programs, eight (31%) were refunded: one under STIP (Title III); one under Title VI; and six under Title I.[1] Only ex-offender projects, with 14% of the programs refunded, had a lower rate of refunding.

Absence of Affirmative Action Policy for Women

Policy regarding female participation under existing contracts seems to be left to the particular federal representative handling each contract. When asked how women are being served under these contracts, federal

---

1. New Approaches to CETA Training: An Overview of the Title III National Program for Selected Population Segments, Strayhorn, L., Goldberg, J., Praeger, A., Holmes, M., U.S. Department of Labor, June, 1978.

representatives provide vague answers such as, "We are trying to get more women."

Recently, as a result of the new Federal regulations for women in apprenticeships and construction, DNP is requiring construction-related programs to aim for 10% women under their new contracts. But, when asked what would happen if the contractors did not reach this goal, vague answers are again forthcoming--"It's hard to get women to do this work;" "Women don't want nontraditional work;" "It's too hard, too dirty, too noisy;" etc. Union resistance is also cited in some instances. Federal representatives state that they are often in the position of negotiating a "realistic" goal for women that contractors can live with.

Robert Glover, Chairperson of the Federal Committee on Apprenticeship, has said that EEO pressures are, in themselves, insufficient to assure affirmative action in employment. These pressures, including legislative, judicial and administrative remedies, he feels work best combined with outreach employment opportunities and vice versa.[1] What better place to implement this concept than in DNP programs which are outreach programs.

CONCLUSIONS

The major conclusions of this report are as follows:

1. DNP appears to have no formal, comprehensive affirmative action policy regarding women for existing contracts. DNP tells us that women are a target group, but we have been unable to find any division-wide policy covering all contracts consistently. In fact, we have found few if any clear and consistent general funding criteria for DNP programs.

2. DNP has funded few employment programs designed specifically for women--four out of approximately fifty. In fact, commitment of DNP money to women's programs was only 1.4% in FY 78. (Considering only the training money--i.e., AOP, JOTP, and NAT-OJT, which amounted to $45,219,000, the percentage allocated to women's programs is still only 2.6%.)

---

1. Placing Minority Women in Professional Jobs, R & D Monograph #55, U.S. Department of Labor, Employment Training Administration, 1978, p. 3.

3. Within all DNP-funded programs, the percentage of females trained and placed is low, and the majority of those placed are found in traditionally "female" jobs with limited skill requirements and low pay. DNP programs in general have not significantly reduced the barriers restricting women's access to well paid skilled jobs.

4. The record so far clearly shows that the specialized women's programs have best served women by their successful and precedent-setting placement of women in skilled jobs and apprenticeships with high earnings potential--and at a cost lower than the average cost per placement in other programs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This report has documented important deficiencies and weaknesses in the way in which the Department of Labor, through the Employment and Training Administration's Division of National Programs, has responded to the needs and concerns of women workers. Based on our long experience with women's employment issues and programs throughout the country, WOW finds these deficiencies and weaknesses inexplicable and unacceptable. The Department of Labor, which allocates enormous resources for employment and training, must bring its policies and practices into conformity with the reality that women now make up a very large part of its constituency. The following recommendations outline steps the Department should take toward that end:

1. The leadership of DOL must make explicit and official the Department's unequivocal commitment to providing equitable employment and training services for women.

2. The experience of the established women's employment programs must be tapped, in order to ensure the success of the planning, development, and operation of programs to implement the new apprenticeship and construction regulations. It is naive to think that outreach, training, and placement efforts in nontraditional work will succeed with women unless women themselves participate in those efforts. DNP must consult and involve women's employment organizations.

3. Affirmative action policy guidelines for women must be formally established and required of all DNP contractors.

4. Given the well-documented disadvantaged status of women in the labor market, DNP must allocate a more equitable share of its funds to training and employment programs for women.

5. DNP must monitor placement rates and quality of placements for women in all funded programs. Standards for placement, rate of pay, job retention, etc. must be established as a basis for program monitoring and evaluation. Programs must be evaluated for funding on the basis of their ability to meet these established standards.

6. DNP must actively seek out, encourage applications from, and fund specialized women's employment programs having the experience, contacts, and credibility required to implement the new regulations, to reach, train and place women in nontraditional skilled occupations. Thus, by undertaking substantial new national initiatives, and by drawing upon technical assistance from experienced women's employment groups, the Department of Labor can begin to meet its responsibilities to that large and long-neglected segment of the workforce that is female.

Attachment #1

TITLE III PRELIMINARY EXPENDITURES FY 78

	$$ in Millions	Percentage of Title III Funds
Summer Youth	670.3	49.4
Youth Community Conservation & Improvement Projects	60.5	4.5
Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects	31.6	2.3
Youth Employment & Training Program	294.0	21.7
	1056.4	77.9
Migrant & Seasonal Farmworkers	66.5	4.9
Indian and Native Americans	58.6	4.3
Skills Training Improvement Programs	43.0	3.2
Help Through Industry Retraining & Employment	8.4	.6
Disabled Veterans Outreach	3.9	.3
National Programs	76.7	5.6
	257.1	18.9
Technical Assessment and Training	16.5	1.2
Labor Market Information	12.3	.9
Research and Demonstration	12.1	.9
Evaluation Program	3.2	.2
	44.1	3.2
GRAND TOTAL	1,357.6	100.0

Attachment #2: APPRENTICESHIP OUTREACH PROGRAMS
FY 76 FUNDING AND FY 77 PLACEMENTS

	FY 78 Funding Level $$ IN MILLIONS	FY 77 Total Placed	FY 77 Women Placed	FY 77 Percentage of Women Placed
Contracts with less than 5% women				
Wisc. Div. of Apprenticeship & Training	.031	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Prep, Cincinnati	.308	141	0	0
Latin American Task Force, Inc. (Chicago, Illinois)	.343	85	0	0
Valley Area Construction Opportunity Program (Sacramento, California)	.189	185	2	1.1
Trade Union Leadership Council (Detroit, Michigan)	.169	103	2	1.9
*International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF), 7 cities	.806	213	5	2.3
So. Cal. Area Construction Opportunities Foundation, (L.A.)	.392	263	9	3.4
United Progress, Inc. (Trenton, N.J.)	.079	40	2	5
Contracts with 5-10% women				
Community Affirmative Action Program (Pasco, Washington)	.070	32	2	6.2
Bay Area Construction Opportunity Program (Oakland, California)	.438	300	26	8.7
Negro Trade Union Leadership Council (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)	.181	131	12	9.2
*United Automobile Workers (UAW), 25 states	.588	300	28	9.3
*Human Resources Development Institute (HRDI-AFL-CIO), 22 cities	1.889	1915	192	10
Contracts with over 10% women				
New Jersey Department of Labor & Industry	.150	93	10	10.7
Anchorage BCTC Alasak	.160	47	6	12.8
Delaware Plan, Inc., Deleware D.O.L.	.065	51	7	13.7
*Recruitment & Training Program (RTP), 27 cities	6.358	4004	709	17.7
Apprenticeship Opportunities Foundation (San Francisco, California)	.215	145	29	20
Mexican American Opportunities Foundation (Los Angeles, California)	.296	218	48	22
*National Urban League (NUL), 37 cities	6.213	4875	1348	27.6
100%				
Better Jobs for Women, YWCA (Denver, Colorado)	.128	110	110	100
Women in Apprenticeship (San Francisco, California)	.108	118	118	100
*RTP Minority Women Employment Program (MWEP), 8 cities	.648 New Project in FY 78			

*National Programs

ATTACHMENT # 3

WOMEN PLACEMENTS BY TRADES 7/1/76 - 6/30/77

	AOP			NAT-OJT*		
	Total Placements	Women Placed	Percentage of Women Placed	Total Placements	Women Placed	Percentage of Women Placed
Asbestos	95	3	3			
Bricklayers	188	3	2	163	15	9
Carpenters	970	40	4	1583	29	2
Cement Mason	209	3	1			
Electrician	763	30	4	92	2	2
Ironworker	262	3	1			
Elevator	51	0	0			
Glazier	22	0	0			
Lather	54	1	2			
Operating Engineer	594	15	3	306	1	.3
Painter	391	40	10	384	23	6
Pipe Trades	473	7	1	67	0	0
Plasterer	58	0	0	903	26	3
Roofers	173	3	2			
Sheet Metal	264	6	2			
Tile Setter	27	2	7			
Other Skilled Trades	1096	138	13	11		
	Sub-Total	294				
Other Occupations	7130	2348	33	4		
TOTAL	12,820	2642	= 20.6%	3513	96	2.7

*From six (6) contractors in the construction trades

89% of all women are placed in "other jobs"

ATTACHMENT # 4

NATIONAL ON THE JOB TRAINING
FY 78 FUNDING AND FY 77 PLACEMENTS

	$$ IN MILLIONS	FY 77 Total Placed	FY 77 Women Placed	FY 77 Percentage of Women Placed
Contracts with less than 5% women				
Operating Engineers, International Union, 11 cities	1.922	310	2	.6
Teamsters Joint Councils (40 & 53 Fleetville, Pa.)	.341	80	1	1.2
National Assn of Homebuilders, 17 states	1.610	738	22	3
Operative Plasterers and Cement Masons, 29 states	1.205	594	19	3.2
United Brotherhood of Carpenters, 51 cities	1.727	642	21	3.2
National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Assn, 54 cities	2.120	619	24	3.9
Bricklayers Union, 20 states	.830	185	8	4.3
Contracts with 5-10% women				
Painters Natl Joint Apprenticeship Committee, 17 states	.756	384	24	6.3
Southern Railway System, (McDonough, Ga.)	.432	1077	73	6.8
Laborer's Union-Modular, 35 cities	.665	661	55	8.3
Contracts with over 10% women				
Appalachian Council (AFL-CIO), 12 states	1.516	2520	301	11.9
Natl Machine Tool Builders Assn, 54 cities	.893	1084	178	16.4
United Automobile Workers (U.A.W.), 25 states	1.503	1717	433	25.2
Natl Assn for Retarded Citizens, 26 states & D.C.	.994	840	307	36.5
Epilepsy Foundation of America	N.A.	580	219	37.8
National Council of Young Israel, 3 cities	.208	185	83	44.9
Amalgamated Clothing & Textile Workers Union, 4 states	.572	215	120	55.8
International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers (IUE), 19 states	.606	578	330	57.1
Green Thumb, Inc., 29 states & D.C.	.555	620	374	60.3
International Assn of Rehabilitation Facilities, 15 states	.281	287	185	64.5
Graphics Arts International Union, 10 cities	.266	83	83	100
Clothing Workers	1.771			
Goodwill Industries	.500			
Furniture Workers	.433			
HEAD	.550			
Printers (Puget Sound, Washington)	.103			
Guam Operating Engineers	.450			
Giant Step (Dept. Commerce OMBE)	.260			

NEW PROJECTS IN FY 78

Attachment 5

PROMOTION & DEVELOPMENT

	Actual Budget Outlay FY 1978
National Alliance of Business	$13,493,040
Human Resources Development Inst.	5,350,884
Center for Community Change	393,467
Mainstream	335,323
United Negro College Fund	542,109
70001, Ltd.	792,138
Health & Education Resources	103,452
George Meany Center Labor Studies	298,350
Electronics Industries Foundation	325,000
Pre-Retirement Planning Center	116,197
University of Texas, Austin	172,744
Federal Bonding Program (FBP)	375,000
Assoc. Yeshivas/B'nai Torah	108,000
National Center, Black Aged	134,512
Federation of Southern Cooperatives	130,625
Carpenters	157,235
Assoc. of Independent Electrical Contractors	99,886
Neighborhood Art Programs - National Organizing Committee	261,933
Human Resources Development Inst. - Performing Arts	223,496
American Assoc. of Small Cities	775,450
Tribal Employment Rights Council	30,029
California Lt. Governor's Office	59,202
A. Philip Randolph Education Fund	632,256
Council for Opportunity in Graduate Management Education	100,000
National Manpower Institute	131,260
Loyola College, New Orleans	131,640
Chemung County, New York	150,000
George Washington University/ Marymount College	492,304
National Urban Coalition	399,000
American Assoc. Community & Junior Colleges	111,449
New Jersey Nat'l. Guard (LEX)	288,426
TOTAL	$26,714,407

COMMUNITY BASED ORGANIZATIONS

	Actual Budget Outlay FY 1978
Puerto Rican Forum	$1,638,747
La Raza	336,115
Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America - Basic	3,545,750
Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America - Academy	500,000
Jobs for Progress, Inc./ Service Employment & Redevelopment (SER)	2,694,157
National Urban League (NUL)	1,599,770
National Urban Indiana Coalition	300,000
TOTAL	$10,614,539